**Examiner’s report – 4th Year History Exam – Summer 2010**

**Overall Comments**

Access to top levels, particularly on 4, 6, and 8 mark questions is straightforward if aware of correct technique. Many who didn’t manage to get into the higher level showed evidence of some of the skills required for the top level (e.g. prioritised conclusion) but not sufficiently consistent to merit award.

Question selection had a great impact on quality of responses. Those who answered 2a and 3a did markedly better than those who answered 2b and 3b.

Timing didn’t seem to be too much of an issue. All candidates completed the last question to varying standards but poor responses didn’t appear to be due to a lack of time.

**Question Specific Comments**

**1a)** Most candidates awarded 4 marks. Mark scheme only requires one supported inference so many candidates spent longer than necessary by giving 2 or 3 inferences. Those who failed to get full marks either paraphrased the source or didn’t use quotes to support their inference.

**1b)** A simple description question answered universally well. Good use of precise details to support descriptions.

**1c)** Not so well answered. Many candidates gave descriptive responses about the Reichstag Fire without focussing on the effects. The best responses focussed on the question and linked factors together.

**1d)** Discrepancy between what the question asks and what the mark scheme wants candidates to do. The question asks why but the mark scheme requires candidates to link reasons to outcomes i.e. how. Most candidates either explained why or how but not both. Many just considered Jews but the question also referred to other minorities also. Several candidates included the Communists as a minority group.

**2a)** Good knowledge of measures taken but inconsistent **evaluation** of how they helped recovery. Many people wasted time by giving lengthy introductions about Stresemann or irrelevant biographical details. Candidates answered this question much better than those who answered 2b as the topic was narrower and had more obvious factual detail that could be used as evidence.

**2b)** Less precise detail present in answers to this question than 2a. Like 2a, candidates offered inconsistent **evaluation** of how position changed.

**3a)** Some excellent links and evaluation of relative importance (L4 skill). Weaker candidates narrated details and referred to events after 1924. Many gave a most important factor in the conclusion (L3 skill) but narrated or didn’t explain fully throughout so couldn’t be awarded high L3.

**3b)** Answered poorly by almost all candidates. Broad question that many saw as a safety net and offered vague descriptions and narratives of the 4 given features of Nazi Germany. Many failed to answer the question, preferring to explain what helped the Nazis consolidate power, rather than focussing on the effects of Nazi rule on Germany.
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